



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

[Handwritten signature]

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,129	12/11/2001	Vij Rajarajan	MS167419.2/40062.151USU1	1970
27488	7590	08/08/2006	EXAMINER	
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			NGUYEN, CINDY	
P.O. BOX 2903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			2161	

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/015,129

Applicant(s)

RAJARAJAN ET AL.

Examiner

Cindy Nguyen

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12-14 and 19-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-14, 19-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 December 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to amendment filed 05/05/06.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments on the rejection under **35 USC § 103** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Double patenting rejection, Examiner didn't see a terminal disclaimer on the records, therefore, double patenting rejection stand rejected. Please resubmit a terminal disclaimer to renders the double patenting rejection will be withdraw.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 12-14 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 13-15 of copending Application No. 10/014293. This is a

provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not yet been patented.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the referenced copending application and would be covered by any patent granted on that copending application since the referenced copending application and the instant application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: receiving a notification that a new resource has been installed on the network environment, retrieving the task information associated with the new resource and storing the task information associated with the new resource on the network, determining whether the task information relates to an existing object type, if so associating the task with the existing object type and if not associate the search information with a new object type.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant would be prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application in the other copending application. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-14, 19, 20, 27-29. and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golson et al. (US 5761505) (Golson) in view of Naito et al. (US 20010029530) hereafter Naito.

Regarding claim 12, Golson discloses: In a network environment having a plurality of managers (34, 35, 36, fig. 2, Golson) for use by a network administrator (30, fig. 2, Golson) to manage multiple resources, each resource having data and capable of performing one or more tasks as directed by the network administrator that modify the resource (col. 1, lines 45-53, Golson), a computer and encoding instructions for executing a method, the method comprising:

retrieving search information associated with data and tasks of the new resource (col. 2, lines 24-35, Golson);

determining that a first portion of the search information relates to a first manager (col. 2, lines 20-61, col. 5, lines 18-27, lines 57-67, col. 7, lines 53-60), Golson);

storing the first portion of the search information in a first manager data store (col. 1, lines 35-65, col. 2, lines 20-61, col. 5, lines 18-27, Golson); and

determining that a second portion of the search information relates to a second manager (col. 8, lines 22-57, Golson);

storing the second portion of the search information in a second manager data store (col. 8, lines 58 to col. 9, lines 8, Golson).

However, Golson didn't disclose: receiving a notification that a new resource has been installed on the network environment. On the other hand, Naito discloses: receiving a notification that a new resource has been installed on the network environment (paragraphs 0220, 0223, Naito). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include receiving a notification that a new resource has been installed on the network environment in the system of Golson as taught by Naito. The motivation being to enable the system to install the new resource and manage with the resource.

Regarding claim 13, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 12. In addition, in addition Golson/Naito discloses: wherein the notification includes the search information (paragraphs 0223, 0224, Naito).

Regarding claim 14, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 12. In addition, Golson/Naito discloses: wherein the search information relates to an object type managed by the first manager, the method further comprising:

determining whether the search information relates to an existing object of the object type, the existing object including information from at least one second resource; (0271-0275, Naito);

if so, associating the search information with the existing object (0271-0275, Naito); and

if not, associating the search information with a new object (0271-0275, Naito).

Regarding claims 19 and 28, all these limitation have been rejected in claims 12 and 13 above. In addition, Golson/Naito discloses: wherein each resource has at least one managed object, the method further comprising: receiving, from a client computer system, a query to modify the network environment (0114, 0221-0223, Naito); accessing a plurality of resources in response to the query (0224, Naito); providing management task options to the client computer related to the query, the management task options including tasks from more than one resource (0214-0217, Naito).

Regarding claim 27, all the limitations of this claim had been rejected in claims 14 and 19 above. It is therefore, rejected as above.

Regarding claims 20 and 29, all these limitation have been rejected in claims 19 and 28 above. In addition, Golson/Naito discloses: receiving a request to display an instance of a first managed object managed by a first resource (0228-0230, Naito); displaying attribute information related to the first managed object (0231, Naito); displaying task information received from at least tow back end resources in response to the request to display (0214-0217, Naito).

Claims 21-26, 30, 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Golson et al. (US 5761505) (Golson) in view of Naito et al. (US 20010029530) hereafter Naito and further in view of Burkett et al. (US 6678889) (Burkett).

Regarding claims 21 and 30, all the limitations have been discloses in claim 19 and 28 above. However, Golson/Naito didn't disclose: wherein first resource includes a

search handler performing search functions on first resource, the method further comprising receiving search handler information related to search function on the first resource in response to the query retrieving data from at least one managed object on the first resource using the search handler and displaying the information data. On the other hand, Burkett discloses: wherein first resource includes a search handler performing search functions on first resource, the method further comprising receiving search handler information related to search function on the first resource in response to the query retrieving data from at least one managed object on the first resource using the search handler and displaying the information data (col. 7, lines 48 to col. 8, lines 61, Burkett). The motivation being to support the launching of multiple application programs and tasks share by users of a computer network (see col. 1, lines 10-13, Burkett).

Regarding claims 22, all the limitation have been rejected in claim 21 above. In addition, Golson/Naito discloses: wherein the search handler related to a search engine on the first resource (0221, Naito).

Regarding claims 23 and 32, all these limitations have been rejected in claims 21 and 30 above. In addition, Golson/Naito discloses: wherein the search handler relates to search engines on more than one resource (0221-0223, Naito).

Regarding claims 24 and 33, all these limitations have been rejected in claims 21 and 30 above. In addition, Golson/Naito/Burkett discloses: the method further comprising in response to the query request to display object information, retrieving search handler information stored in the search store; and displaying additional search

handler information from the search store to allow the user to refine the query (col. 7, lines 67 to col. 8, lines 61, Burkett).

Regarding claims 25 and 34, all these limitation have been rejected in claims 19 and 28 above. In addition, Golson/Naito discloses: the method further comprising: associating a first search component with a first object type, wherein the first search component related to object attributes managed by a first resource and associating a second search component with the first object type, wherein the second search component related to object attributed by a second resource.

Regarding claims 26 and 35, all these limitation have been rejected in claims 19 and 28 above. In addition, Golson/Naito/Burkett discloses: wherein each of the plurality of resources provides information to the search manager in XML format (col. 7, lines 47-65, Burkett).

1. Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gish (U.S 6052711) Object-oriented system, method and article of manufacture for a client server session web access in an interprise computing framework system.


Meltzer et al. (U.S 6125391). Market makers using documents for commerce in trading partner networks.

2. Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4025. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gaffin Jeffrey can be reached on 571-272-4160. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.


Cindy Nguyen
July 12, 2006


FRANTZ COBY
PRIMARY EXAMINER